Project Managers' Advisory Group

MINUTES
November 15, 2010

Attending: **(* = by phone)**

Bob Giannuzzi	EPMO
Kathy Bromead	EPMO
Janet Stewart	EPMO
Charles Richards	EPMO
Alisa Cutler*	EPMO
John O'Shaughnessy*	ITS
Vicky Kumar*	OSC
Lucy Cornelius*	DPI
Barbara Swartz*	DHHS DPH
Ellen Zimmerman*	DHHS DPH
Karen Guy*	DHHS DIRM
Sarah Liles*	DHHS DMH
Sarah Joyner*	ESC
Lawrence Sanders*	ESC
David Johnson*	DENR
Chris Cline*	NCCCS
Betty Cogswell*	DOT
Colleen McCarthy*	SOS
Jim Tulenko*	OSC

Bob Giannuzzi welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Bob solicited and received approval of the October minutes.

Bob announced that Sandra Hewitt of ITS recently passed the PMP exam.

Kathy Bromead reported that the last session of the PMP Exam Prep Class was to be conducted by Gaye Mays on 11/16 covering Procurement. Review sessions will be held later.

Bob reported the following upcoming events at NCPMI:

NCPMI Venue	Speaker	Date/Topic
General Membership	Vicky Kumar	January 20 (6:00 PM) Project Managers As Creative and Innovative
Public Sector LIG	Michael Agrillo	December 2 (5:30 PM) Business Process Modeling and Analysis
PMO Committee		No meeting scheduled
Leadership Committee		No meeting scheduled

Information Systems Committee		No meeting scheduled

The progress of the EPMO work groups was discussed next.

- **SDLC** to address integration of alternate SDLCs (e.g., Agile) into the current process/workflow. No members present, but Kathy Bromead advised that the group's charter is imminent. At their next meeting, Doug Banich will be discussing Agile SDLC impact on a project's TASD.
- **Agency Procurement** to develop a common (within agency) procurement process. Kathy reported that the final process document will be released 11/18.
- **Business Case** to develop guidelines and provide training on justifying projects based on cost/benefits analysis. Bob Giannuzzi again solicited volunteers to join the team. The first team meeting will be held after the Thanksgiving holiday.

Alicia Cutler reported on Methodology Task Group activity. She presented the modifications drafted for a revised Closeout document. These were well received. The draft will be sent out with these minutes for final review. Feedback needs to be sent to Alisa by 11/19.

Bob presented highlights from *The State of the PMO* report published by PM Solutions consultant group. This was based on a survey of several firms and government agencies. It very positively reflected the PMO value proposition and the increased buyin by executives. The report was cited in a November 2010 PM Network article entitled *PM Survival Guide*. The report can be downloaded from http://pmsolutions.com/research.

Charles Richards reported that another session of CR training delivered as an Adobe Connect webinar will be scheduled sometime after Thanksgiving.

Janet Stewart advised that the next process update is now slated to be available on the EPMO website on 11/30. This will include the revised Closeout document and the agency procurement workflow. Kathy added that the Project Info tab will have a Security Deviation reference number field for tracking projects that made such a request.

Charles reported on the PPM hardware refresh activity. The VM environment was refreshed on 11/5. Several volunteers participated in performance testing. Results indicated some improvement. John O'Shaughnessy offered that he saw some substantial improvement.

Bob expressed disappointment in the lack of sharing best practices or experiences by the group in these meetings. He asked that participants seek out possible offerings from their respective agencies at upcoming PMAG meetings.

Lessons Learned from recently closed projects are included in the Appendix.

Meeting adjourned at 4:163 PM.

NEXT MEETING

Monday, December 20, 2010 at 3:30
333 Six Forks Road Conference Room 3 or (919)981-5520

https://its.ncgovconnect.com/r96139571/

APPENDIX

Lessons Learned Documentation

Exhibit A

Dept. of Correction – DOC/ITS Exchange Migration

Initiation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Business Case / Project Charter	Determined that the project scope is greater than just migrating user email accounts from GroupWise to Exchange, but also must address Spam & Anti-virus filtering along with Mimosa NearPoint e-mail archiving.
2. Project Approval Process	Even though this project was Legislative Mandated, OSBM required benefits to approve the project. Close communication with the EPMO along with some of their mentoring resulted in a positive approval process with little impediments to the PPM Tool workflow.
3. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Positive – Status meetings and reports were conducted and created, respectively, on a weekly basis. Also see #1 above.
4. Managing Customer Expectations	DOC PM, ITS PM, and the Technical team met weekly beginning in February to establish a detailed Project Plan (communication plan) as the basis for setting customer expectations.

Planning & Design Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Project Approval Process	Same as Initiation
2. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Same as Initiation
3. Managing Customer Expectations	Brought in ITS Subject Matter Experts to advise the team on planning to meet DOC security requirements, Service Desk, and NCID implementation for approximately 10,000 DOC users. A good Communication Plan resulting in numerous communication emails would prove to be a key factor in customer satisfaction and expectations. DOC PM, ITS PM, and the Technical team met weekly beginning in February to establish a detailed Project Plan (communication plan) as the basis for setting customer expectations.
4. Risk Management	DOC PM, ITS PM, and the Technical team met weekly to discover potential risks and develop mitigation strategies and action plans.
5. Issue Management	DOC PM, ITS PM, and the Technical team met weekly to develop mitigation strategies and action plans for issues.
6. Monthly Status Reporting	Having close communication with the EPMO as well as their mentoring created a smooth transition through Monthly Status Reporting in the PPM Tool.

7. Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	DOC PM, ITS PM, and the Technical team met weekly beginning in February to establish a detailed Project Plan to manage the effort.
8. Requirements Mapping	Established a Test Plan Document aligned with DOC Requirements

Execution & Build Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Project Approval Process	Same as above
2. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Same as above
3. Managing Customer Expectations	Same as above
4. Risk Management	Same as above
5. Issue Management	Same as above
6. Monthly Status Reporting	Same as above
7. Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	Conducted several small pilots to determine the amount of users/data that could reasonably be migrated over a weekend or during a week night to finalize the Project Schedule.
8. Project Communication	Communication was a key factor that played in customer satisfaction and expectations. A good training plan helped as well. Do not over load customers with too much communication as they will disconnect (example: oh here is another communication about the new email system, not going to read it).
9. Testing (test execution, verification & validation, test scripts, test cases)	Weekly on-site testing and documented Pilot Test Results, which were discovered items that needed to be added to the Readiness Checklist, User Communications, and to the Test Plan. Monitored the network traffic to determine if the network pipe and infrastructure was sufficient enough to handle the amount of data being pushed (adjustments were made). This all resulted in a positive project outcome.
10. Requirements Verification & Validation	The Pilots and testing sessions also helped to identify missed requirements and to verify and validate the requirements.
11. Hosting Provider (setting up environments)	Identifying port openings and pipe size needed prior to Implementation resulted in a positive project outcome.

Implementation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Project Approval Process	Same as above
2. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Same as above
3. Managing Customer Expectations	Same as above
4. Risk Management	Same as above
5. Issue Management	Same as above
6. Monthly Status Reporting	Same as above
7. Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	DOC determined that only weekend migrations would be conducted thus pushing out the schedule (support issues). Mimosa NearPoint implementation was delayed which impacted the roll-out/schedule.
8. Resource Management (internal & external resources)	ITS Technical Team struggled with resource backup coverage for a seamless handoff during some of the migration efforts. Not enough experienced resources available for this size project. ITS Deactivating NCID accounts was frustrating and resulted in DOC resource time to compensate (NCID accounts possibly should be administered/controlled through agency).
9. Vendor Management / Vendor Performance / Vendor Deliverables	ITS Project Technical Team (not ITS Technical Lead alone) needed better communication and coordination in vendor Interface with Iron Mountain/Mimosa NearPoint. This resulted in lack of accurate communication on the critical milestone for meeting the September 1 readiness date for rolling out Mimosa Archive folder to DOC (and all other Exchange) users.
10. Production Readiness (software / hardware, process, personnel)	A more robust readiness checklist earlier in the projects life and the ITS Technical Team having more experience with this type of migration would have positioned the team for success with fewer heroics. Issue with NCID synchronizing with the mail system should have been resolved during the migration instead of waiting for

	a newer version of NCID at a later date to resolve. Excellent Help Desk Support and Email Application Knowledge Experts made a difference of project disaster or project moving forward with management and customer confidence.
11. Other	It was very productive and advantageous to have a member of the ITS Technical Team on-site rather than off site for support (2 days) after each migration.

General Comments:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Project Management	A close working relationship between the ITS PM and DOC PM proved invaluable for a project of this magnitude.
2. DOC/ITS Technical Team	The knowledge shared and coordination along with weekly testing (test beds) between the two teams (ITS/DOC) proved to be invaluable for a project of this magnitude.

Exhibit B

ITS - Email Archiving

Initiation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Business Case / Project Charter	Socialized business case to senior management early in the timeline. Aware of scope.
2. Level 1 Budget	Do not allow a project to be approved to go forward unless funding has been obtained and encumbered.
3. Project Approval Process	Always seems to take longer than planned.
4. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Socialized business case to senior management early in the timeline.
5. Other	**Data Center Capacity Requirements are not currently considered early on in the project life cycle for external customer-driven projects or for internal ITS projects, but depend upon the Services Transition Provisioning process for obtaining data center allocations for network, rack space, power and cooling as a part of the provisioning schedule-vetting process.** **This Provisioning process happens too late in the project life cycle from a Data Center Operations and Capacity Planning standpoint, and has become especially critical in the current EDC situation where there is no capacity available to support new equipment.**

Planning & Design Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Updated Business Case	Project team expects that due to the critical nature of the project, OSBM will quickly identify a funding source, but this did not happen The longer the system was not implemented, the more money ITS and Agencies had to spend on legal discoveries and excess storage costs. Total Cost of Ownership funding was not obtained until approximately six months after project approval and efforts were well underway.
2. Updated Procurement Plan	Provisioning requires excessive lead times for server provisioning and is a bottleneck for ITS to be able to provide the required server and network infrastructure for Vendors to be able to meet their standard timelines for performing the contracted applications work.

3. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Early on the team socialized the risks associated with the lack of funding and required purchase of underpinning storage.
4. Issue Management	Early on the team socialized the risks associated with the lack of funding and required purchase of underpinning storage.
5. Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	Project Manager expects the project team members to participate in good faith to achieve project goals and objectives, but this did not happen. Storage Operations and NetBackup team did not reach consensus on the Storage Design approved by the E-mail Archiving Service Owner, but did not make their disagreement known to the project team in project meetings at the appropriate time.
6. Other	• There is no Standard Provisioning Process for storage and the Services Coordinator did not engage in the necessary coordination efforts in a timely manner for the Storage devices. Due to Procurement Rules, Project Team could not provide specifics of Storage purchase to Provisioning until 5/11 when Storage award was formally completed. Procurement Rules were NOT broken in this regard, may have delayed the Provisioning staff from beginning efforts in a timely manner. • Delays to the Project were experienced during the period when the Project Team was preparing the RFQ for approval for issuance via 204J, the Storage Operations and NetBackup staff contacted EMC regarding the use of EMC storage devices. This action resulted in a demonstration to SCIO on 3/11 by EMC stating that ITS-owned Data Domain devices can be used to meet E-mail Archiving storage requirements. However, Data Domain storage devices do not meet the mandatory Mimosa NearPoint requirements since they are not clustered and do not provide for de-duplication of the primary SQL database.

Execution & Build Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	• Services Coordinator did not begin Phase 2 of the Provisioning Project for the Storage, but for servers only at a low priority level. • There is no Standard Provisioning Process for storage and the Services Coordinator did not engage in the necessary coordination efforts in a timely manner for the Storage devices. • Project Manager expects Services Coordinator to follow up with the Core Provisioning team to formulate a Vetted Schedule for all of the Provisioning Project Phase 2 items, but this did not happen resulting in more than 10 weeks delay in the underpinning servers' order being placed.
2. Development / Build	▪ Project Team anticipates ITS fellow employees will act in accordance with procedures and good faith in carrying out the service requests to support the project's objectives, this was not the case. ▪ Escalation process will be followed if necessary to avoid project delays due to criticality of the E-mail Archiving Project, but this was not the case. ITS management did not allow for service request escalation.
3. Hosting Provider (setting up environments)	• ITS Eastern Data Center environmental (power, air conditioning, floor space) were not adequately managed regarding required capacities over time. Thus, a longer planning and approval lead time was required for any server changes to the EDC. • Provisioning requires excessive lead times for server provisioning and is a bottleneck for ITS to be able to provide the required server and network infrastructure for Vendors to be able to meet their standard timelines for performing the contracted applications work. This impacts the ability for Teams to adequately plan schedules and resources. • Who owns the responsibility to follow-up on the Purchase Order placed to ensure that it is being worked and a Delivery Date is actually issued? WDC Servers requested via PR 5/4 Order Placed with HP on 6/15. HP cancelled part of the server order upon receipt due to part number

	mismatches in their system. Project Team expects Service Coordinator to be able to determine the Delivery Date and follow-up. Not clear who owns this responsibility within ITS. • Storage array in floor location previously weighed 200 lbs more than the IBM N series storage array, yet reinforcement work delayed the project 2 days. • Core Provisioning Teams will be represented on all of the Provisioning calls, if not the call will be rescheduled to include participation/ representation of all Core Provisioning Team members, this did not happen as required for this critical project. • Project Team expected that E-mail Archiving Storage would be approved for placement at the EDC and WDC. Certainly, Data Operations staff members were anticipating the arrival of the Storage since Ross Yannayon, Dwane Johnson, and Tina Likens were involved in the project including the Storage RFQ process and had raised no issues regarding placement of the Storage in the EDC as called for in the approved System Design Document. Also, the Services Coordinator had begun the Phase 2 Provisioning Project. Thus, a critical, high-priority Project was disapproved for placement in the EDC and such disapproval was issued based upon reasons that had not previously been communicated to the Project Team by the persons with the knowledge that such EDC issues existed. Another, example of participating in Project efforts without good-faith participation. • Cable pulls for Storage gear were assigned to 2nd and 3rd shift resulting in a 2-day delay to the project. Project Team anticipated that once the Service Request was issued, it would be given a high priority and would be completed during the 1st shift. The original Service Request was closed by Data Center Operations due to the fact that the Storage Switches had not yet been delivered onsite and racked. When the 2nd Service Request was issued on 6/1, the physical location for one of the servers to be connected was indeterminable by the 2nd or 3rd shift installer because someone neglected to affix a label on the outside case or rack of the server. The issue was not raised until the following morning and then was completed overnight rather than on 1st shift, a 2-day delay. The Storage switches at EDC were still not fully cabled until 6/15/10 and ports were not hot for Mimosa NearPoint server installs at EDC by Platform Services. • On 6/2 Storage Configuration for Acceptance Testing purposes was begun. The Engineer submitted a Service Request issued to Platform Services to perform specific server updates and perform a server re-boot that resulted in an Emergency RFC. Project Team expected to be able to escalate E-mail Archiving Service Requests in order to get the Storage into production as soon as possible. Project Team is not allowed to expedite the Service Requests for the critical, high priority E-mail Archiving project as directed by DSCIO.
4. Other	ITS provisioning processes rely on a 30-day vendor delivery cycle and thus, ITS provisioning processes are not flexible so that expedited Vendor delivery cannot be accommodated.

Implementation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Vendor Management / Vendor Performance / Vendor Deliverables	Communications of critical milestone planning with the Vendor needs to be followed up in writing to ensure accurate communication between the two parties.
2. Production Readiness (software / hardware, process, personnel)	Communications of critical milestone planning with the Vendor needs to be followed up in writing to ensure accurate communication between the two parties and socialized with all team members.